

REMARKS

Claims 26-29, 32, 74-77, 79-86, and 88-95 are pending. Claims 30, 74, 78, and 87 have been canceled. Claims 79, 81, 83-86, 88, 90, and 92-95 have been amended.

Appreciation is expressed for the indication of allowance of claims 26-29, 32, and 75-77 and for the indication of allowability of claims 79, 80, 86, 88, 89, and 95.

In response, claim 79 has been amended to explicitly include the limitations of claims 30 and 78 and to therefore put claims 79 and 80 in condition for allowance. The applicant respectfully submits that these amendments in no way change the scope of coverage of claims 79 and 80.

Claim 86 has been amended to explicitly include the limitations of claim 30 and to therefore put claims 81-86 in condition for allowance. The applicant respectfully submits that these amendments in no way change the scope of coverage of claim 86. Claims 80 and 83-85 have been amended to correct their dependence.

Claim 88 has been amended to explicitly include the limitations of claims 74 and 87 and to therefore put claims 88 and 89 in condition for allowance. The applicant respectfully submits that these amendments in no way change the scope of coverage of claims 88 and 89.

Claim 95 has been amended to explicitly include the limitations of claim 74 and to therefore put claims 90-95 in condition for allowance. The applicant respectfully submits that these amendments in no way change the scope of coverage of claim 95. Claims 90 and 92-94 have been amended to correct their dependence.


It is noted that claims 30, 74, 78, 81-85, 87, and 90-94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Maynard, U.S. Patent No. 5,405,337. The applicant respectfully submits that the particular parts of the cited reference that the Examiner has relied upon have not been designated as nearly as practicable, and the pertinence of each reference has not been clearly explained, both as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2). Nowhere in her Office Action of August 24, 2001 does the Examiner

make any specific reference to Maynard or the specific portions of the Maynard reference thought by the Examiner to teach the claim limitations.

Nevertheless, the applicant has assumed that the annotations made to the copy of the Maynard reference provided by the Examiner are indicative of the specific reasons for the Examiner's rejections. It is noted that there is no such annotation regarding: (1) the "an addressable thin-film heater element in communication with the shape memory alloy portion for activation of selected micro-actuators" claim limitation in claims 30 and 74; or (2) the "wherein the micro-actuators are arranged in segmented joints" limitation in claims 78 and 87. However, in the interest of bringing prosecution of this application to a rapid conclusion, the applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner's claim objections.

Because all of the specific reasons (e.g., the annotations of the Maynard reference) for rejecting claims 30, 74, 78, 81-85, 87, and 90-94 have not been fully made of record, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to make those specific reasons of record in any subsequent Office Action.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on <u>Dec. 22</u> , 2001.	
 Attorney for Applicant	<u>12/22/01</u> Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Marc R. Ascolese
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,268

